

REMARKS

Status of the Claims

Claims 1, 3-8, 10-16, 18, and 20 are now present in this application. Claims 1, 8, 15, 18, and 20 are independent.

Claims 2 and 9 have been canceled. Claims 1, 3, 8, 10, 15, 18, and 20 have been amended. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner states that claims 2, 4-7, 9, 11-14 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the early indication of allowable subject matter in this application. As set forth above, the limitations of objected-to claims 2 and 9 have been added into independent claims 1 and 8, respectively, and therefore independent claims 1 and 8 should be in condition for allowance. Also, claims 3-7, and 10-14 depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claims 1 and 8, and are therefore allowable based on their dependence from claims 1 and 8 which are believed to be allowable.

Independent claims 15, 18, and 20 recite a combination of elements in a display apparatus including display control means. Applicant respectfully submits that this combination of elements as set forth in independent claims 15, 18, and 20 are not disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record.

Consideration and allowance of claims 1, 3-8, 10-16, 18, and 20 are respectfully requested.

Claim Objections

The Examiner has objected to claim 20 because it lacks a written description in the specification. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

In the Advisory Action, the Examiner indicates that claim 20 recites "a computer readable recording medium" and the specification describes "a computer program storage medium," and they are two different things. The Examiner requests that the specification be amended to describe this element.

Applicants disagree that “computer-readable recording medium” and “computer program storage medium” are two different things. The specification discloses several examples of computer program storage medium at pages 21-23 of the specification, each of which would be understood by one of ordinary skill in the art as being types of computer-readable recording medium. In other words, the present specification does not disclose a storage medium that is not computer-readable. In any case, Applicants have amended the specification to state “computer-readable recording medium” instead of just “storage medium”

Applicants request that the objection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 3, 8, 10, 15, 16, and 18-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Application Publication 2003/0120742 (Ohgami) in view of GB 2 343 334 (Cho). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

A complete discussion of the Examiner's rejection is set forth in the Office Action, and is not being repeated here.

CLAIMS 1, 8

With regard to the rejection of claims 1, 3, 8, and 10, while not conceding the appropriateness of the Examiner's rejection, but merely to advance prosecution of the instant application, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1 and 8 have been amended to include all limitations of objected-to allowable claims 2 and 9, respectively, thereby automatically placing independent claims 1 and 8 into condition for allowance, along with dependent claims 3-7 and 10-14.

CLAIM 15

While not conceding the appropriateness of the Examiner's rejection, but merely to advance prosecution of the instant application, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 15 has been amended to recite a combination of elements in a display apparatus including display control means. Applicants respectfully submit that this combination of elements as set

forth in independent claim 15 is not disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record, including Ohgami and Cho.

Claim 15 recites “display control means for outputting a signal causing the display means to display display information which indicates that it is not possible to receive a video signal and whose display format is changed according to the recognition information signal detected by the recognition information signal detection means.”

In other words, claim 15 relates to a feature in which a recognition information signal can be received even if it is not possible to receive a video signal, which enables display of display information in a display format according to the recognition information signal.

In an example embodiment (Fig. 3), when it is detected that it is not possible to receive a signal (step S1), display of a video signal is stopped (step S2) and information indicating that a signal cannot be received is displayed (step S5, S4).

The Examiner’s “response to arguments” includes an argument that Cho teaches the claimed displaying display information which indicates that it is not possible to receive a video signal and the display format of the display information is changed, by way of a disclosure that poor reception information is displayed as a bar graph. (Office Action at page 5, bottom paragraph).

With respect to Cho, if the data error rate signal can be considered as teaching the claimed recognition information signal, Cho discloses changing a display format according to the data error rate signal (e.g., interference level graphic bars).

As Applicants have previously explained, in Cho, if it is not possible to receive a radio frequency signal (i.e., no signal strength would be indicated), then there would also be no data error rate, and the interference level bar graph would likely show no interference level.

In order to obtain allowance of claim 15, claim 15 has been amended to positively recite the change in display format. According to the specification (see Fig. 3), a change in format can include stop displaying of a video signal (step S2) and displaying instead information indicating that signal could not be received (step S5).

Subsequently, claim 15 has been amended to recite display control means for outputting a signal causing the display means to stop displaying of the video signal and to change display format of the display means according to the recognition information signal detected by the

recognition information signal detection means to displaying display information indicating that it is not possible to receive the video signal.

Applicants submit that Ohgami and Cho, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose at least this claimed feature of the display control means.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

With regard to dependent claim 16, Applicants submit that claim 16 depends from independent claim 15 which is allowable for the reasons set forth above, and therefore claim 16 is allowable based on the dependence from claim 15. Reconsideration and allowance thereof are respectfully requested.

CLAIMS 18, 20

Claim 18 recites “when it is determined in the first step that the video signal is unable to be received, at least making a determination as to whether or not a recognition information signal, that is for determining whether or not a display apparatus is identified with a wireless transmitting apparatus, is identical to a predetermined recognition information signal.”

The Examiner indicates that the claim does not recite that the predetermined recognition information signal is a data error rate. (Office Action at page 6, lines 1-2).

From this statement, it appears that the Examiner did not understand the Applicants’ argument.

Applicants had argued that Cho does not at least disclose a data error rate as a predetermined recognition information signal, such that a determination is made whether or not a recognition information signal is identical to a predetermined recognition information signal. In other words, Cho discloses “data error rate.” Using Cho’s disclosed “data error rate,” Applicants submit that because Cho does not at least disclose the data error rate as being “predetermined,” then Cho cannot teach determining whether or not a recognition information signal is identical to a predetermined recognition information signal.

In any case, the Examiner’s counter argument does not particular address the features recited in claim 18, as well as claim 20.

With respect to claim 15, the Examiner relies on Cho's display of a bar graph as an indication of the probability of successful communication. To the contrary, the present invention relates to providing a display that indicates that it is not possible to receive a video signal. For example, as shown in Fig. 4 of the present application, a message of "SIGNAL COULD NOT BE RECEIVED" would be displayed. Applicants submit that Cho does not particularly address a condition where it is not possible to receive a signal.

In any case, even if Cho's bar graph may be displayed in order to indicate low signal strength, Applicants submit that Cho does not teach displaying a message that it is not possible to receive a signal.

Subsequently, Applicants have amended claimed 18 and 20 to explicitly recite "displaying a message...that it is not possible to receive a signal."

Applicants submit that Ohgami and Cho, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose at least this claimed feature.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

In view of the above amendment, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact **Robert W. Downs**, Registration No. 48222 at the telephone number of the undersigned below to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Director is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge any fees required during the pendency of the above-identified application or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448.

Dated: September 13, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By Robert Doans #48222
Charles Gorenstein *Robert Doans*
Registration No.: 29271
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road, Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
703-205-8000